

The REAL reason why the US invaded Iraq!

Post Reply Post Reply

Page

5

<1 34567 16>

Author Message Topic Rating Rate Topic Topic Search Topic Search Topic Options  
Topic Options

Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623

Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To  
This Post Posted: 14 October 2007 at 4:15am

Originally posted by Tom123 Tom123 wrote:

LOL!!! The Americans invaded Iraq to make Sadr look good- and the Israelis invaded Lebanon to help Hizbullah- BRILLIANT!!!!

You should seriously consider publishing this in MAD magazine or some other similar source! The Mahdi Army is not 'pro-American' and the Hizbullah is not 'pro-Israeli'. The fact is Shia Muslim fighters have inflicted more casualties on Israeli and American invading forces in the Middle East than anyone else. Many Sunni armed groups (like Ansar Al Sunnah or Al Qaeda in Iraq) hate the Jaish Al Mahdi because they are Shias and they see the Shia as heretics.

I am not btw a supporter of either the Mahdi Army or Hizbullah or Sunni Iraqi resistance groups, or the American and Iraqi puppet government forces they are battling (when they are not fighting each other).

I believe as a Christian that all war and violence today is against Christ's teachings and therefore I am opposed to it. So I am not 'defending' Sadr or Hizballah- like the people they are fighting they too have blood of the innocent on their hands.

However, I believe that to accuse Hizballah or Jaish Al Mahdi of being pro-US or pro-Israeli governments is absurd.

They only pretend to be against the US and Israel, I explained why here:

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=8924&PN=1&TPN=2](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=8924&PN=1&TPN=2)

Originally posted by Sawtul Khilafah Sawtul Khilafah wrote:

As you may well know, the Western Governments have always been planning against Muslim countries, they created Israel and are now making war after war.

They knew very well that Muslims will want to fight back and they wont just sit there while all this was going on, so they came up with a very clever plan, which was to create forces around whom religious Muslims and those who want to do something about these wars would gather.

They knew that so long as they control the leaders of these groups/Governments, they would not Truly harm them in any way and would only carry out limited attacks and just use words and words and words the rest of the time to fool people into thinking that they are serious, while in reality these fakes would actually be helping the West and actually fighting against the real enemies of the Western occupation by simply accusing any real group that does not join them of being "agents of the west" or "agents of Israel".

However, this could only succeed through Shiism as it is they who believe in Taqlid (blinding obeying their scholars) so this plan could only work well on the Shiah's (also because Shiism is closely linked to western secret societies :

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=9460&PN=3](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=9460&PN=3))

Therefor, they first tried to portray Sunnis as pathetic, careless cowards and in order

to do this they gave power to those in Sunni countries who were willing to openly obey the western Superpowers.

It was then that they created their fake Islamic Government in Iran and the so called "Hezbollah". Iran and "Hezbollah" have helped increase the popularity and conversion to Shiism and Iran has been publishing hundreds if not thousands of books propagating Shiism. In these books you will often see that they claim that Shiism is "heroic" while Sunnis are "Pathetic" and if anyone wants to be on the "heroes" side they would have to become Shiahs (the "victory" of "Hezbollah" in 1982 was meant to portray Shiism as just that - also Iran in 1979 became the only "Islamic fundamentalist" country in the world, thus Shiism became the hope for those Muslims who cared about their Ummah.)

After 1982, the "Hezbollah" did very little (practically nothing) except propagate Shiism and promote themselves as the "heroic saviours of Islam", however after so many years it was required to once again remind people of the supposed "heorism" of the Shiah "Hezbollah" so then there was this recent war, the outcome of which I actually predicted during the early days of the war!!!

Here's the link: [http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=6007&;PN=16&TPN=1](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=6007&;PN=16&TPN=1)

If you look at Sadr and "Hezbollah", one thing that they have in common is that they love "ceasefires" or "peace negotiations".

Now there is nothing wrong with making peace....but making peace in the middle of a war and while the occupation still continues simply does not make sense, but all FAKE groups do that. They first rise up and become popular, once enough people have joined and have become very famous they suddenly sit back and relax!!

On the other hand when you look at REAL resistance groups, such as the Chechen Mujahideen and the Sunni resistance groups in Iraq (examples: Ansar Sunnah, Tawhid wal-Jihad, Jayshal Islami fel Iraq) they continue to fight so long as there is war and occupation, killing thousands of enemy soldiers and themselves losing many of their men and leaders.

They continue to fight until they either win, or lose, something that imposters would not do because they dont want to win (they dont want to destroy their masters) and they dont want to lose (they are not willing to sacrifice their lives and obviously if they are destroyed the whole plan would be ruined).

Also read my post on this link (the long one with the picture, scroll down):

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=6007&;PN=16&TPN=12](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=6007&;PN=16&TPN=12)

Now as you may know, Iran supports, funds and arms both the "Mahdi army" and the "Hezbollah". Hasan Nasrollah leader of "Hezbollah" even said "We are Iran" (meaning they are a part of Iran).

Of course Iran also claims greatly to oppose the US and Israel and even calls the USA "The Great Satan"!

Now, if you think I'm a "conspiracy theorist" read the following:

Or it could be said that the drama started in 1981, just after Reagan came into office, when U.S. officials learned that Israel was ignoring the 1979 American ban on the sale of arms to Iran. At the time Iran badly needed spare parts for the American-made weapons it had acquired during the Shah's reign. In their hour of need the Iranians looked to Israel, which had also supplied weapons to the Shah.

The Israelis reportedly set up Swiss bank accounts to handle the financial end of the deals. Despite its embargo, the U.S. appeared to look the other way. Administration officials seemed interested in Israel's notion that the arms sales would help foster ties with leaders in the Iranian military.

In late August, Israel sent a planeload of arms to Iran. The cargo consisted mostly of Soviet-made weapons that the Israelis had captured in Lebanon.

In the fall of 1985 Iran was presumably making payments to Israel through the Swiss bank accounts set up to handle Israeli-Iranian arms sales in the early 1980s. At the same time, Israel was demanding that the U.S. replace the items that had been taken from Israeli stockpiles and sold to the Iranians. But Washington reportedly grew suspicious about the finances. In asking for fresh weapons, Israeli officials claimed that they could not pay full price, but Washington suspected that Iran was paying the Israeli dealers far more than the arms were actually worth. The U.S. urged Israeli officials to drop the arms merchants from the Iran deal and allow Jerusalem to take over the operation.

Israel sold Iran \$12 million worth of weapons at a price that included a markup as high as 250%, or \$42 million.

Source: TIME Magazine Article,  
(<http://www.time.com/time/europe/tim...n/ir861208.html>)

TIME Archives:

<http://www.time.com/time/archive/pr...,963021,00.html>

time-proxy.yaga.com/time/archive/preview/0,10987,963021,00.h tml

-----  
Reagan would wait and disclose his intentions in private. So it was with the disputed decision in August 1985 to condone arms sales by Israel to Iran. ♦He called and said, ♦I think we ought to get on with that. Let♦s go ahead with that,♦ McFarlane told the commission.

Source: MSNBC Article,  
(<http://msnbc.msn.com/id/5165237/site/newsweek/>)

-----  
The book ♦The Iran Contra Connection♦ discusses the relationship between Iran and Israel:

The Israeli Interest in Iran

♦ Though Israel, along with the United States, suffered a grievous loss with the fall of the Shah, its leaders concluded that lasting geo-political interests would eventually triumph over religious ideology and produce an accommodation between Tel Aviv and Tehran. The onset of the Iran-Iraq war in 1980 gave Israeli leaders a special incentive to keep their door open to the Islamic rulers in Iran: the two non-Arab countries now shared a common Arab enemy. As Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon told the Washington Post in May 1982, justifying Israeli arms sales to Tehran, ♦♦we hope that diplomatic relations between us and Iran will be renewed as in the past.♦ Four months later he told a Paris press conference, ♦Israel has a vital interest in the continuing of the war in the Persian Gulf, and in Iran♦s victory.♦ Such views were not Sharon♦s alone; Prime Ministers Itzhak Shamir (Likud) and Shimon Peres (Labor) shared them too♦

The Arms Channel Opens

Israel lost no time supplying the new Khomeini regime with small quantities of arms, even after the seizure of the U.S. embassy. The first sales included spare parts for U.S.-made F-4 Phantom jets; a later deal in October 1980 included parts for U.S.-made tanks♦

Notes Ha♦aretz correspondent Yo♦av Karny ♦The cloak of secrecy that surrounds Israeli arms exports is so tight that one can compare it to the technique for smuggling hard drugs.♦ When caught in the act, Israeli officials maintained they were simply selling domestic arms, not embargoed U.S. weapons. ♦Whenever we would get word of shipments,♦ one American official explained, ♦the State Department would raise the issue with Israel, and we would get the standard lecture and promises that there were no U.S. weapons involved.♦

◆[The Israelis] signed a deal with Iran◆s Ministry of National Defense to sell \$135,842,000 worth of arms, including Lance missiles, Copperhead shells and Hawk missiles◆

In November 1981, Israeli Defense Minister Sharon visited Washington, shopping for approval of similar arms sales [to Iran]. His U S. counterpart Caspar Weinberger, flatly turned him down. Sharon then went to Haig, hoping for acquiescence from the State Department. Again, McFarlane handled many of the discussions with Sharon and Kimche; this time Haig unequivocally opposed any violation of the embargo.

Yet as in 1979-80, Israel pursued its policy anyway, in flat violation of its arms re-export agreements with the Pentagon. In a May 1982 interview with the Washington Post, Sharon claimed that Israeli shipments had been cleared ◆with our American colleagues◆ months earlier and that details of all the shipments were supplied to the administration. Later that year, Israel◆s ambassador Moshe Arens declared that Israel◆s arms sales were cleared at ◆almost the highest levels◆ in Washington◆

And those shipments would continue to be enormous in size, estimated by experts at the Jaffee Institute for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv at \$500 million in value from 1980-83. Other arms market experts have put the total value at more than \$500 million a year, including aircraft parts, artillery and ammunition.

(Source: p.169, ◆Irrangate: The Israel Connection◆ excerpted from the book The Iran Contra Connection by Johnathan Marshall and Peter Dale Scott, South End Press, 1987, paper)

-----

After the Revolution, Iranians continued to buy arms from the United States using Israeli, European, and Latin American intermediaries to place orders, despite the official United States embargo. Israeli sales, for example, were recorded as early as 1979. On several occasions, attempted arms sales to Iran have been thwarted by law enforcement operations or broker-initiated leaks. One operation set up by the United States Department of Justice foiled the shipment of more than US\$2 billion of United States weapons to Iran from Israel and other foreign countries. The material included 18 F-4 fighter-bombers, 46 skyhawk fighter-bombers, and nearly 4,000 missiles. But while the department of Justice was attempting to prevent arms sales to Iran, senior officials in the administration of President Ronald Reagan admitted that 2,008 TOW missiles and 235 parts kits for Hawk missiles had been sent to Iran via Israel.

Despite official denials, it is believed that Israel has been a supplier of weapons and spare parts for Iran◆s American-made arsenal. Reports indicate that an initial order for 250 retread tires for F-4 Phantom jets was delivered in 1979 for about US\$27 million. Since that time, unverified reports have alleged that Israel agreed to sell Iran Sidewinder air-to-air missiles, radar equipment, mortar and machinegun ammunition, field telephones, M-60 tank engines and artillery shells, and spare parts for C-130 transport planes

Source: Global Security Article (<http://www.globalsecurity.org/milit.../iran/intro.htm>)

[Back to Top](#)

[Sponsored Links](#)

[Back to Top](#)

[Duende View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 27 July 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 651      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Duende](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[Reply](#)[Direct Link To This Post](#)  
Posted: 17 October 2007 at 3:25am

Finding the REAL reasons for just about anything that has happened in the past 50-70 years is far harder than one would think.

Sawtul, I seem to remember, was thoroughly caught up by the Illuminati agenda and frequently mentions various secret societies supposedly responsible for this or that inexplicable historical anomaly. Besides these immediately obvious secret societies and their converging agendas, there is a far more menacing and frightening elite group directly responsible for practically every political and social event since the discovery of oil in Texas.

Coming to conclusions such as the delusional secret alliance between the US-Iran-Shia, is actually the SIMPLE answer to what is a complex trail of clues left by members of the Bilderberg organisation and the Trilateral

Commission.

Here's an extract from an interesting paper available at [Globalresearch.ca](http://Globalresearch.ca):

### Imperial Playground: The Story of Iran in Recent History

by Andrew G. Marshal

In the 70s, the Shah of Iran, which was at the time a secular [non-religious] nation, was stepping up the process of industrializing the country of Iran. At this time, Europe, especially at the behest of Germany and France, was pursuing greater cooperation and integration, and in doing so, created the European Monetary System (EMS), under which the nine European Community member states made the decision to have their central banks work together to align their currencies to one another. This would allow for greater competition between the Anglo-American dominated ♦petrodollar monetary system♦ and the rising European Community, which was still feeling the effects of the OPEC oil shock. Part of the agreement between Germany and France was to develop an agreement with OPEC countries in the Middle East to exchange high-technology and equipment for a stable-priced oil supply. The Anglo-Americans saw this as a threat to their hegemony over the oil market, and so, ♦Carter had unsuccessfully sought to persuade the Schmidt [German] government, under the Carter administration♦s new Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, to abandon export of virtually all nuclear technology to the developing sector, [underdeveloped countries, i.e. Iran] on the false argument that peaceful nuclear plant technology threatened to proliferate nuclear weapons, an argument which uniquely stood to enhance the strategic position of the Anglo-American petroleum-based financial establishment.♦ This effort to persuade Germany was to no avail, so the



Anglo-Americans had to pursue a more drastic policy change.

This policy formed when, In November 1978, President Carter named the Bilderberg group's George Ball, another member of the Trilateral Commission, to head a special White House Iran task force under the National Security Council's Brzezinski. Ball recommended that Washington drop support for the Shah of Iran and support the fundamentalist Islamic opposition of Ayatollah Khomeini. Robert Bowie from the CIA was one of the lead case officers in the new CIA-led coup against the man their covert actions had placed into power 25 years earlier. This is further corroborated by author and journalist, Webster Tarpley in his book, George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography, in which he stated, Carter and Brzezinski had deliberately toppled the Shah of Iran, and deliberately installed [Ayatollah] Khomeini in power. This was an integral part of Brzezinski's arc of crisis geopolitical lunacy, another made-in-London artifact which called for the US to support the rise of Khomeini, and his personal brand of fanaticism, a militant heresy within Islam. U.S. arms deliveries were made to Iran during the time of the Shah; during the short-lived Shahpour Bakhtiar government at the end of the Shah's reign; and continuously after the advent of Khomeini. The Defense and Foreign Affairs Daily reported in their March 2004 edition that, In 1978 while the West was deciding to remove His Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi from the throne, [Ayatollah] Shariatmadari was telling anyone who would listen not to allow Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and his velayat faghih (Islamic jurist) version of Islam to be allowed to govern Iran. Ayatollah Shariatmadari noted: We mullahs will behave like bickering whores in a brothel if we come to power ... and we have no experience on how to run a modern nation so we will destroy Iran and lose all that has been achieved at such great cost and effort. This was exactly the point of

putting them in power, as it would destabilize an industrializing country, and as William Engdahl further pointed out, ♦ Their scheme was based on a detailed study of the phenomenon of Islamic fundamentalism, as presented by British Islamic expert, Dr. Bernard Lewis, then on assignment at Princeton University in the United States. Lewis ♦ scheme, which was unveiled at the May 1979 Bilderberg meeting in Austria, endorsed the radical Muslim Brotherhood movement behind Khomeini, in order to promote balkanization of the entire Muslim Near East along tribal and religious lines. Lewis argued that the West should encourage autonomous groups such as the Kurds, Armenians, Lebanese Maronites, Ethiopian Copts, Azerbaijani Turks, and so forth. The chaos would spread in what he termed an ♦ Arc of Crisis, ♦ which would spill over into the Muslim regions of the Soviet Union. ♦

Bernard Lewis ♦ concept was also discussed in a 1979 article in Foreign Affairs, the highly influential seasonal journal of international relations put forward by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the pre-eminent policy think tank in the United States, whose leadership and many members also share membership with the Trilateral Commission and Bilderberg Group. The article stated, ♦ The ♦ arc of crisis ♦ has been defined as an area stretching from the Indian subcontinent in the east to the Horn of Africa in the west. The Middle East constitutes its central core. Its strategic position is unequalled: it is the last major region of the Free World directly adjacent to the Soviet Union, it holds in its subsoil about three-fourths of the proven and estimated world oil reserves, and it is the locus [central point] of one of the most intractable conflicts of the twentieth century: that of Zionism versus Arab nationalism. Moreover, national, economic and territorial conflicts are aggravated by the intrusion of religious passions in an area which was the birthplace of

Judaism, Christianity and Islam, and by the exposure, in the twentieth century, to two competing appeals of secular modernization: Western and communist, and further stated, Against the background of these basic facts, postwar American policy in the Middle East has focused on three major challenges: security of the area as against Soviet threats to its integrity and independence, fair and peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and safe access to its oil.

- - - - -

William Engdahl continued in his examination of the 1979 revolution/coup in Iran, of which he said, The coup against the Shah, like that against Mossadeq in 1953, was run by British and American intelligence, with the bombastic American, Brzezinski, taking public credit for getting rid of the corrupt Shah, while the British characteristically remained in the background. During 1978, negotiations were under way between the Shah's government and British Petroleum for renewal of the 25-year oil extraction agreement. By October 1978, the talks had collapsed over a British offer which demanded exclusive rights to Iran's future oil output, while refusing to guarantee purchase of the oil. With their dependence on British-controlled export apparently at an end, Iran appeared on the verge of independence in its oil sales policy for the first time since 1953, with eager prospective buyers in Germany, France, Japan and elsewhere. The strategy was to have religious discontent against the Shah [which] could be fanned by trained agitators deployed by British and US intelligence, and so As Iran's domestic economic troubles grew [as a result of the British refusing to buy Iranian oil in a strategy of economic pressure], American security advisers to the Shah's Savak secret police implemented a policy of ever more brutal repression, in a manner

calculated to maximize popular antipathy to the Shah. At the same time, the Carter administration cynically began protesting abuses of human rights under the Shah, and the strategy even entailed using the BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation), which gave the Ayatollah Khomeini a full propaganda platform inside Iran during this time. The British government-owned broadcasting organization refused to give the Shah's government an equal chance to reply. Further, during the Christmas season of 1979, one Captain Sivash Setoudeh, an Iranian naval officer and the former Iranian military attaché before the breaking of diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran [in 1979], was arranging arms deliveries to [Ayatollah] Khomeini out of a premises of the US Office of Naval Research in Arlington, Virginia.

With the successful revolution/coup in Iran in 1979, the Shah was exiled to Egypt, and back in the United States, Bilderberg and Trilateral Commission co-founder and international banker David Rockefeller was approached by Princess Ashraf, the sister of the deposed Shah, who was suffering from cancer, and she was turning for help to the man who ran one of the leading U.S. banks [Chase Manhattan now, JP Morgan Chase], one which had made a fortune serving as the Shah's banker for a quarter century and handling billions of dollars in Iran's assets. Ashraf's message was straightforward. She wanted Rockefeller to intercede with Jimmy Carter and ask the President to relent on his decision against granting the Shah refuge in the United States, and further, The new Iranian government also wanted Chase Manhattan to return Iranian assets, which Rockefeller put at more than \$1 billion in 1978, although some estimates ran much higher. And so, a public campaign by Rockefeller along with [Henry] Kissinger and former Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman John McCloy to find a suitable home in exile for the Shah was undertaken,

and Rockefeller also pressed the Shah's case personally with Carter when the opportunity presented itself. On April 9, 1979, at the end of an Oval Office meeting on another topic, Rockefeller handed Carter a one-page memo describing the views of many foreign leaders disturbed by recent U.S. foreign policy actions, including Carter's treatment of the Shah. According to a Time Magazine article in 1979, Kissinger concedes that he then made telephone calls to three senior officials and paid two personal visits to [Secretary of State] Vance to argue that a U.S. visa should be granted the Shah. He expressed that view volubly in private conversations with many people, including journalists. He said that the last of his direct pleas was made in July. He and Rockefeller then sought to find asylum elsewhere for the Shah. Rockefeller found a temporary residence in the Bahamas, and Kissinger persuaded the government of Mexico to admit the Shah on a tourist visa. Eventually their efforts were successful, as it was further revealed, The late Shah had friends at Chase Manhattan Bank and in the highest echelons of trilateral power. David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger played instrumental roles in arranging the Shah's exile and shaping US policy toward Iran.

[Back to Top](#)

Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623

[Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) [Quote](#) [Sawtul Khilafah Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[Reply](#)[Direct Link To This Post](#) Posted: 17 October 2007 at 10:14am

Wait a minute, are you actually implying that they got rid of the Shah and replaced him with Khomeini just to stop Iran from prospering financially??? Since the Shah was openly their ally, surely they could have made more money with him around than the supposed anti-American anti-West Khomeini.

I agree that things are more complicated than they seem, but it's certainly not all about money.

[Back to Top](#)

[Duende View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 27 July 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 651      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) [Thanks\(0\)](#)   [Quote Duende](#) [Quote](#)   [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)  
Posted: 17 October 2007 at 1:06pm

Tut tut Sawtull. Go read the whole document and stop inferring that I (as opposed to the author of the extract) am implying anything. You have a long way to go. Find out about the Bilderberg organisation and the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations and countless other 'think tanks' and US/Globalisation policies before you dismiss the notion that it is 'all about money'. It is all about 'globalisation' which is the latest buzzword replacing the more sinister (and actual name) One World Government ideology which is ALL ABOUT THE ELITE MAINTAINING THEIR GLOBAL POWER AND PROFIT, at your, and my, expense.

It is difficult to accept at first sight, but the goal is and has been for some time, to DESTROY the growth economy, and destroy nation states, in favour of elite government over the dumbed-down masses. The article goes to some lengths to help you get your mind around the seemingly contradictory US/UK actions to prevent Iran from prospering. As we can all see, the prevention of economic growth maintains Iran and countless other countries in the region nicely under control of the organisations and foundations created by the elite (MFI, World Bank, UN etc.) which all ultimately allow the elite to continue their safe, comfortable lives of luxury, while so-called developing nations serve as their production sites. Allowing us all, no encouraging us, to believe there is a religious motive behind it all, is simply another psy-ops tactic, which has worked extremely well

Read this article as it will help you formulate your conspiracy theory, with actual facts as opposed to your twisted and tortuous anti-Iranian/Shia diatribe.

Edited by Duende

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623

[Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post Posted: 23 October 2007 at 4:41pm

Today, on Fox News Sunday, Weekly Standard editor Bill Kristol declared that the U.S. was close to victory in the Iraq war, arguing that the only concern left for the U.S is dealing with alleged Iranian involvement in Iraq:

"We're winning in Iraq. That is the absolute crucial precondition to having success in the broader fight against Islamic jihadism. And I think we are going to have to be serious about dealing with both their intervention in Iraq which is now the only real threat, I think, incidentally, to relative success in Iraq and their nuclear program."

As you can see they are actually trying to change history. I mentioned numerous other examples on my earlier posts such as my post at the bottom of this page:  
[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=8411&PN=1&TPN=1](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=8411&PN=1&TPN=1)

Back to Top

Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post Posted: 29 October 2007 at 2:27pm

Duende, here's CFR coming to Iran's rescue!!!  
[http://www.infowars.com/articles/ww3/iran\\_200\\_dollar\\_oil\\_if\\_war\\_with\\_iran\\_says\\_cfr\\_pres.htm](http://www.infowars.com/articles/ww3/iran_200_dollar_oil_if_war_with_iran_says_cfr_pres.htm)

Kissinger did the same: <http://darulislam.info/forum/showthread.php?t=3244>



The same people who control the Neo-Cons are trying to turn people against a future war on Iran... !!! I explained why here:

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=8924&PN=1&TPN=1](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=8924&PN=1&TPN=1)

Back to Top

Duende View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 27 July 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 651      Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Duende Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post  
Posted: 30 October 2007 at 4:03am

Sawtul, read up on the techniques used by the CFR to plant supporters of both sides of an argument, thereby continuously confusing the public as to their real intentions. As supreme master of these techniques, Kissinger is very unlikely to reveal the truth about ANYTHING although, a grain of truth may be planted in whatever he states so as to lead us all along.



Personally, I feel Kissinger and his fellow seekers of One World Government are annoyed with G.W and Cheney who consistently try to get the upper hand over them, and some public knuckle-rapping is in order.

Incase you haven't been able to bone-up on the CFR, here's a small idea:  
The CFR members include executives from the New York Times,

Washington Post, L.A Times, Wall Street Journal, NBC, CBS, ABC, FOX, Time Fortune, Business Week. Candidates from both sides of the political spectrum, most of the relevant government posts, especially Foreign Policy obviously, CIA, FBI, and the IRS. Henry Kissinger is the key man in the CFR. The president of the CFR, and founder, is David Rockefeller, world class banker extraordinaire.

Since before 1942 the CFR and Bilderberg Club have been working towards a One World Government, which is largely what today's UN is being prepared to become, governing the three world regions of Europe (notice it has already become an entity with its own constitution) a Pan-American union, (the introduction of the Amero- replacing the Peso/ Canadian Loony/U.S Dollar is already in the public awareness) and Pacific/ Asian Union. The powerfully rich rule these regions behind the curtains of the current U.S Admin and the European Parliament, via bodies such as the CFR, Trilateral Commission, Tavistock Institute and Royal Institute of International Affairs (UK) along with a whole range of seemingly unrelated think-tanks and foundations (Rockerfeller Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Carnegie, Ford etc.,)

Psycho-political campaigns directed by the CFR and Bilderberg Club, mostly prepared by the Tavistock Institute in the UK, are designed to manipulate and create perpetual tensions in order to imprint upon the world the public opinion that best suits their ends. There are three basic rules of influencing conduct: Carefully elaborated misinformation must contain an element of truth: the elaborate web of deceit must be so ornate as to make proof and actual evidence supporting it, intangible, by hiding key information from the public, and thirdly; the actual misinformation must not discredit a source of credibility such as the

media, which are therefore responsible for this role of credible source.

The Western media are almost entirely under the control of the CFR.

Placing themselves on both sides of an argument they demoralize, confuse and confound and very few of us can see through the smokescreen and determine the real motives.

From what I can judge, I see Ahmadineyad and the Iranian Ruling Council as one of the last bastions against this world-domination of the ultra-rich US based bankers, along with Cuba and Venezuela, and the emerging Russian oligarchy.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) Posted: 30 October 2007 at 10:11am

I'm actually way ahead of you (just because I dont talk about something doesnt mean I dont know about them). The CFR, the UN, the US Government and Israel, as well as Iran, Russia and France are all on the same side.

It's like a game of chess, one side plays the black the other the white, and we are just pawns in their game until and unless we find out what's really going on (that's why I concern my posts with revealing their biggest secrets such as the real reason why they invaded Iraq and the real motives of Iran and "Hezbollah")